

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
WAYCROSS DIVISION

FILED  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
WAYCROSS DIV.

2011 APR 19 PM 1:46

CLERK R. Oles  
SO. DIST. OF GA.

FRANKLIN L. WILLIAMS,

Petitioner,

vs.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA and  
EDWARD J. TARVER, U.S. Attorney,

Respondents.

CIVIL ACTION NO.: CV511-031

**MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

Petitioner Franklin Williams ("Williams"), who is currently incarcerated at the Federal Correctional Institution in Fort Worth, Texas, filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 to attack the sentence he received in this Court.<sup>1</sup> For the reasons which follow, Williams' petition should be **DISMISSED**.

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

Williams was convicted in this Court, after a jury trial, of one count of distribution of more than five grams of cocaine base and one count of distribution of more than 50 grams of cocaine base, in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1). The Honorable William T. Moore, Jr., sentenced Williams to 292 months' imprisonment on each count, to run concurrently with each other and with Williams' revoked state parole term, 10 years'

<sup>1</sup> Williams names as Respondents the United States of America and Edward Tarver, the United States Attorney for the Southern District of Georgia. The only proper respondent in a section 2241 petition, however, is the warden of the facility at which the petition is housed. Rumsfeld v. Padilla, 542 U.S. 425, 435 (2005).

supervised release, and a \$200.00 special assessment. Williams filed an appeal. The Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed Williams' convictions and sentences. United States v. Williams, 262 F. App'x 165 (11th Cir. 2008).

Williams filed a section 2255 motion in which he asserted he received ineffective assistance of trial counsel. The undersigned recommended that Williams' § 2255 motion be denied, and Judge Moore adopted this recommendation as the opinion of the Court. (CV508-34, Doc. Nos. 4, 61). Williams has filed post-judgment motions and other pleadings in CV508-34, including a motion to amend or to re-open the case based upon his claims of actual innocence and ineffective assistance of counsel. (CV508-34, Doc. No. 154).

Williams filed another § 2255 motion in which he alleged that he received ineffective assistance of appellate counsel because his attorney on appeal would not argue that his trial counsel was ineffective and because his appellate counsel refused to file a motion for a new trial. Williams also alleged that he was denied the right to have a psychological evaluation for his post-traumatic stress disorder for which he has been treated for 30 years. Williams contended that he was denied his right to confront witnesses at trial, in violation of the Sixth Amendment. Williams averred that he was arrested without a warrant and that he was improperly under electronic surveillance, in violation of the Fourth Amendment. Williams asserted that Judge Moore was biased and had a conflict of interest. Finally, Williams asserted he was convicted in the absence of evidence other than hearsay. The undersigned recommended that this motion be dismissed as a successive section 2255 motion. Judge Moore adopted the Report and Recommendation as the opinion of the Court, and Williams' motion was

dismissed. (CV509-104, Doc. Nos. 33, 38). Williams has filed post-judgment pleadings in that case, as well, such as a motion for a new trial based on newly discovered evidence and a claim based on actual innocence. (CV509-104, Doc. Nos. 46, 54).

Williams filed a section 2241 petition, as well as a § 2255 motion, in which he asserted that his right to confront witnesses at trial was violated. Williams also asserted that the only evidence introduced at trial was hearsay and that he should be granted a new trial. Williams averred that he was incompetent to stand trial, his counsel was ineffective, he should have been afforded a psychological evaluation, and the electronic surveillance conducted was illegal. According to Williams, his convictions and sentences resulted in a miscarriage of justice. (CV511-18 and CV511-19). The undersigned has issued Reports in each of these cases recommending that Williams' petition and motion be dismissed.

In this petition, Williams asserts that one of the many cases he has filed in this Court was transferred to another district court, which has resulted in the miscarriage of justice and has rendered him unable to prove his innocence.<sup>2</sup> Williams also asserts that this Court should vacate his sentence or grant him a new trial in the interest of justice and based on newly discovered evidence.

#### **DISCUSSION AND CITATION TO AUTHORITY**

Ordinarily, an action in which an individual seeks to collaterally attack his conviction should be filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 in the district of conviction. 28 U.S.C. § 2255; Sawyer v. Holder, 326 F.3d 1363, 1365 (11th Cir. 2003). However, in those instances where a section 2241 petition attacking custody resulting from a federally

---

<sup>2</sup> Williams filed a motion to transfer his petition in Case Number CV510-59, and the Honorable Lisa Godbey Wood granted his motion by Order dated July 27, 2010. (CV510-59, Doc. Nos. 5, 7).

imposed sentence is filed, those § 2241 petitions may be entertained where the petitioner establishes that the remedy provided under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 "is inadequate or ineffective to test the legality of his detention." Wofford v. Scott, 177 F.3d 1236, 1238 (11th Cir. 1999). Section 2255 provides:

An application for a writ of habeas corpus [pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241] in behalf of a prisoner who is authorized to apply for relief by motion pursuant to this section, shall not be entertained if it appears that the applicant has failed to apply for relief, by motion, to the court which sentenced him, or that such court has denied him relief, *unless it also appears that the remedy by motion is inadequate or ineffective to test the legality of his detention.*

28 U.S.C. § 2255(e) (emphasis supplied). The petitioner bears the initial burden of presenting evidence that affirmatively shows the inadequacy or ineffectiveness of the § 2255 remedy. Ramiro v. Vasquez, 210 F. App'x 901, 904 (11th Cir. 2006).

Williams has styled his action as a petition for writ of habeas corpus filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. Williams asserts that section 2241 is the appropriate statute under which to seek relief because § 2255 is "inadequate and ineffective as to actual innocence and miscarriage of justice under § 2255(e), savings clause, with newly discover[ed] evidence(s)." (Doc. No. 1, p. 4).

Courts which have addressed whether remedies under § 2255 are inadequate or ineffective have found them to be so in very limited circumstances. See In re Dorsainvil, 119 F.3d 245, 248-49 (3d Cir. 1997) (holding that § 2255 remedy inadequate when intervening change in law decriminalizes conduct and defendant is barred from filing successive motion); Cohen v. United States, 593 F.2d 766, 771 n.12 (6th Cir. 1979) (holding that § 2255 remedy ineffective where defendant was sentenced by three courts, none of which could grant complete relief); Stirone v. Markley, 345 F.2d 473,

475 (7th Cir. 1963) (explaining that § 2255 remedy potentially ineffective where sentencing court refused to consider a § 2255 motion or unreasonably delayed consideration of motion); Spaulding v. Taylor, 336 F.2d 192, 193 (10th Cir. 1964) (holding that § 2255 remedy ineffective when sentencing court was abolished). None of the circumstances of these cases exists in the case *sub judice*.

To successfully use a § 2241 petition to circumvent the procedural restrictions of a § 2255 motion, a petitioner must satisfy the savings clause of § 2255. The savings clause of § 2255:

applies to a claim when: 1) that claim is based upon a retroactively applicable Supreme Court decision; 2) the holding of that Supreme Court decision establishes the petitioner was convicted for a nonexistent offense; and 3) circuit law squarely foreclosed such a claim at the time it otherwise should have been raised in the petitioner's trial, appeal, or first § 2255 motion.

Wofford, 177 F.3d at 1244.

Williams fails to present evidence that his claims are based on a retroactively applicable Supreme Court decision, that he was convicted of a non-existent offense, or that he was foreclosed on a previous occasion from making the same allegations as he does in the instant petition. Williams has not satisfied the requirements of § 2255's savings clause, and thus, cannot "open the portal" to argue the merits of his claim. See Wofford, 177 F.3d at 1244 & n.3; see also Dean v. McFadden, 133 F. App'x 640, 642 (11th Cir. 2005) (noting that all three requirements of the Wofford test must be satisfied before section 2255's savings clause is satisfied).

Williams cannot circumvent the requirements for § 2255 motions by styling his petition for habeas corpus as being filed pursuant to § 2241. "[W]hen a federal prisoner's claims fall within the ambit of § 2255, the prisoner is subject to that section's

restrictions." Medberry v. Crosby, 351 F.3d 1049, 1061 (11th Cir. 2003). Williams is doing nothing more than "attempting to use § 2241. . . to escape the restrictions of § 2255." Wofford, 177 F.3d at 1245.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the foregoing, it is my **RECOMMENDATION** that Williams' petition for writ of habeas corpus, filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241, be **DISMISSED**.

**SO REPORTED** and **RECOMMENDED**, this 19<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2011.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JAMES E. GRAHAM  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE